

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated November 25, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this amendment, claims 1, 12, 19 and 20 are hereby amended. And, claims 2-6, 13-14, 16, 21 and 22 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the claims 1, 12, 19 and 22 are objected to because of informalities. Applicants respectively submit that in view of the amendments in claims 1, 12, 19 and 22, this objection is now believed to be moot. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Claims 19 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yui (US 5,677,741) in view of D'Souza et al. (US 7,046, 255).

Claims 1-11 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yui (US 5,677,741) in view of D'Souza et al. (US 7,046, 255) and further in view of Kimura et al. (US 6,008,786).

Claims 12-14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yui (US 5,677,741) in view of Berreta (US 5,416,890) and further in view of Kimura et al. (US 6,008,786).

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yui in view of D'Souza et al. and further in view of kimura et al. is respectfully traverse and consideration is requested.

Independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a lookup table to store a gray scale value corresponding to a predetermined gray scale level of a B color, wherein the predetermined gray scale level is a gray scale level immediately prior to a reference gray scale level to begin reducing a color reproducibility, and the stored gray scale value is the maximum gray scale value

corresponding to the maximum gray scale level displayable by the LCD panel for which the color reproducibility of the B color is not reduced” and “a data processing unit that analyzes a gray scale level of the B color in received image information, replaces a gray scale value of the gray scale level of the B color in the received image information with the stored gray scale value corresponding to the predetermined gray scale level of the B color retrieved from the lookup table in response to a determination that the gray scale level of the B color in the received image information is greater than the reference gray scale level, and outputs a image information including a compensated gray scale value of the gray scale level of the B color”. The cited references do not teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 7-11 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 1, which Applicant submits is allowable.

The rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yui in view of Berreta and further in view of Kimura et al. is respectfully traverse and consideration is requested.

Independent claim 12 is allowable in that claim 12 recites combination of elements including, for example, “storing a gray scale value corresponding to a predetermined gray scale level of the B color in a lookup table, wherein the predetermined gray scale level is a gray scale level immediately prior to the detected gray scale level, and the stored gray scale value is the maximum gray scale value corresponding to the maximum gray scale level displayable by the LCD device for which the color reproducibility of the B color is not reduced” and “compensating a input video data by analyzing a gray scale level of the B color in the input video data, replacing a gray scale value of the gray scale level of the B color in the input video data with the stored gray scale value corresponding to the predetermined gray scale level of the B color retrieved from the lookup table in response to a determination that the gray scale level of the B color in the input video data is greater than the reference gray scale level, and outputting a input video data including a compensated gray scale value of the gray scale level of the B color”. The cited references do not teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12.

Claims 17 and 18 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 12, which Applicant submits is allowable.

The rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yui in view of D'Souza et al. is respectfully traverse and consideration is requested.

Independent claim 19 is allowable in that claim 19 recites combination of elements including, for example, “determining whether the gray scale level of the B color is greater than a predetermined reference gray scale level to begin reducing a color reproducibility in the LCD device” and “applying the received image information to the LCD device upon a determination that the gray scale level of the B color is not greater than the predetermined reference gray scale level” and “compensating the received image information by analyzing a gray scale level of the B color in the received image information, and replacing a gray scale value of the gray scale level of the B color in the received image information with a gray scale value of a gray scale level immediately prior to the predetermined reference gray scale level retrieved from a lookup table in response to a determination that the gray scale level of the B color in the received image information is greater than the predetermined reference gray scale level”. The cited references do not teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19.

Claims 20 and 23 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 19, which Applicant submits is allowable.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37

Application No.: 10/691,312
Amdt. dated March 25, 2009
Reply to Office Action dated November 25, 2008

Docket No.: 8733.904.00

C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: March 25, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant